Attachment to Independent Case Review Report for CDRU # 130 Case File # 95-265594.

Material Examiner Malone (RQ)

Remarks:				
	-			

	INDEPEN	NDENT CAS	E REVI	EW R	EPORT		
Independent Review con	nducted by:	STEVE RO	BERTSO	v			,
Area(s) of Expertise:	HAIR AND	FIRERS					
Review commenced at:	<i>// :00 A</i> _ (Ti	me), <u>5//</u>	8 199	(Date)			
File#: 95-6	65594	-					
Laboratory #(s):	1022105	/	5100	303.	2		
· <u>. 5</u>	5032605	3					
_5	0515012						
		Examiner(s)	& Symbol	s			
RQ	Reviewed	Not Reviewed			Reviewed	Not Reviewed	
<u>WZ</u>	_ ㅁ	x _	•			0	
LK		# _			. 0	0	
		Materials :	Reviewed				
Trial testimony transcrip	et(s) of:M	ICHAEL MA	LONE .			_	
Testimony Date	e(s): <u>NOT K</u>	NOWN F	Pages: _ <i>22</i>	9-2	66		
Laboratory Report(s):	<i>-</i>						
Laboratory Nu	<i>50515</i> mber: <u>5022.</u>	TO12. 1054 5032	6053	Date: _	8-7-85	_	
Laboratory Nu	mber: <u>5/00.</u>	3032_		Date: <u>/</u>	2-10-8:	<u>s</u>	
Laboratory Nu	mber:			Date: _			
Examiner Bench Notes	of: RQ	UNKNOWN	<u>Techniciai</u>			•	
Laboratory Nu	mber: <u>5022</u>	1054		-			
Laboratory Nu	nber: <u>5032</u>	60S3					
Laboratory Nu	nber: <u>505/</u> 2	5012 510	003032				
		Page	of <u>4</u>				
		Initials:	SUL.		<u>CF</u>	RM - 10209	

;

		_	
-			
	<u> </u>		
2		of Review	7
File#: <u>95-26</u>	<u>5594</u> Item or	Specimen # Review	ved: <u>01,02,05,022</u> 3, K6, K7
		<u></u>	(3, K6, K7
•	Review of Laboratory Re	eport(s) and Ber	ich Notes:
	Note: Numbered comment		
	additional pages for any "No" or	"Onable to Determ	ine" Kesponses
			MIGNIG MORROOF ROTARI AN ING MARIKATO
protocols, and	analytic techniques available at the Y sation results set forth in the laborate	time of the origina cs □ No 风U	nable to Determine ted and adequately documented in the
protocols, and 2) Are the examin	analytic techniques available at the Y sation results set forth in the laborate Y	time of the original control o	ol examination(s)? nable to Determine ted and adequately documented in the
protocols, and 2) Are the examin bench notes?	analytic techniques available at the Y sation results set forth in the laborate Y	time of the originates No AU ory report(s) supportes ANo U Testimony:	al examination(s)? nable to Determine ted and adequately documented in the nable to Determine
protocols, and 2) Are the examin bench notes?	enalytic techniques available at the Y ention results set forth in the laborate Y Review of Note: Numbered comment additional pages for any "No" or "	time of the originates No AU ory report(s) supportes ANo U Testimony:	al examination(s)? nable to Determine ted and adequately documented in the nable to Determine ow or on
protocols, and 2) Are the examin bench notes?	enalytic techniques available at the Y ention results set forth in the laborate Y Review of Note: Numbered comment additional pages for any "No" or "	time of the originates No AU ory report(s) supportes ANo U Testimony:	al examination(s)? nable to Determine ted and adequately documented in the nable to Determine ow or on sine" Responses
protocols, and 2) Are the examin bench notes?	Review of Note: Numbered comment Note: Numbered comment dditional pages for any "No" or "	time of the original ces No No NO Corporation of the original ces No	al examination(s)? nable to Determine ted and adequately documented in the nable to Determine ow or on sine" Responses
protocols, and 2) Are the examination bench notes? Transcript not available and Testimony consisten 4) Testimony consisten	Review of Note: Numbered comment additional pages for any "No" or "	time of the original ces No	al examination(s)? nable to Determine ted and adequately documented in the nable to Determine ow or on time" Responses Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 4

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed) HAIR COMPARISON WAS PERFORMED BUT THERE IS INSUFFICIENT
DOCUMENTATION TO DETERMINE IF TESTS WERE DONE IN A
SCIENTIFICALLY ACCEPTABLE MANNER.
#2. RESULTS IN THE LABORATORY REPORT AREINADEQUATERY DOCUMENTED
IN THE BENCH NOTES. NOTES ARE NOT DATED; REVIEWER IS
UNABLE TO INTERPRET EXAMINER'S NOTES DUE TO HIS USE OF
ABBREVIATIONS. NO DOCUMENTATION OF THE NLETS COMMUNICATION
OR THE TELEPHONE CALL TO THE SUBMITTING AGENCY AS DESCRIBED
IN THE REPORT, WAS FOUND.
#3. Examiner TESTIFIED THAT HAIR MUST HAVE AT LEAST IS
CHARACTERISTICS TO HAVE VALUE FOR COMPARISON. THIS HAS NO
SCIENTIAC BASIS KNOWN TO THIS REVIEWER.
Review completed at: 5:15P (Time), 5/18/199 (Date)
Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour):
I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of
(Signature) (Date)

Page 3 of 4

Additional Comments (Set forth by question #, if applicable)

File#: 95-265594
IN RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE NEGRO
POPULATION WOULD HAVE HAIRS WITH ALL 20 OF THESE
CHARACTERISTICS! EXAMINER TOSTIFIED ONE IN 5,000". THE
SAME ANSWER WAS GIVEN TO THE SAME QUESTION CONCERNING
CAUCASIAN HAIR. (SEE p 243-248) WHILE THE EXAMINER
BASES HIS ANSWER ON HIS EXPERIENCE, THERE HAS NO PUBLISHED
SCIENTIFIC STUDY TO CONFIRM THIS. IN FACT, THE ONLY
PUBLISHED STUDY CONCERNING PROBABILITY OF A HAIR MATCH HAS
BEEN CRITICIZED AND DEBATED AND DOES NOT HAVE THE
SUPPORT OF THE FORENSIC COMMUNITY.
THE EXAMINER TESTIFIED THAT HE ESTIMATES THE PROBABILITY
OF A TWO WAY HAIR TRANSFER MATCH AT 1 IN 25,000,000. THIS
IS IN CONTRAST TO THE REPORTED RESULTS OF "CONSISTENT WITH"
AND TO HIS PREVIOUS TESTIMONY, AND GIVES WEIGHT TO THE
HAIR COMPARISONS WITHOUT SCIENTIFIC SUPPORT
#4. Same comments As #3
\$5. ON p. 248-249 OF THE TRANSCRIPT, GRAMINOR SAYS HE'S NOT AN
EXPERT ON STAST STATISTICS BUT ESTIMATES PROBABILITY OF THIS TWO WAY
HAIR TRANSFER MATCH AT I IN 25,000,000.

Page 4 of 4
Initials: Succ